DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 044 471 UD 011 043

AUTHOR Beagle, Simon
TITLE Evaluating MES: A Survey of Research on the More Effective Schools Plan.
INSTITUTION American Federation of Teachers, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Apr 69
NOTE 7p.
AVAILABLE FROM American Federation of Teachers, 1012 14th St., N.W., Washington, D.C. 20005 (Order no. 319, $0.10)

EDRS PRICE EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$0.45
DESCRIPTORS *Program Evaluation, *Reading Programs, *Reading Research, *Reading Tests, Surveys, Test Results
IDENTIFIERS *More Effective Schools Plan

ABSTRACT

This booklet is a guide to research done on More Effective Schools (MES) through April, 1969. The Bureau of Educational Research of the New York City Board of Education found that the mean gain in reading comprehension of MES students over non-MES students ranged from 2.5 to 4.5 school months relating to the period studied. The booklet summarizes this new longitudinal study and also reports the results of previous research on MES. These facts, coupled with the enthusiasm that one finds among students and teachers enrolled in the program, are considered the best testimonials to the basic soundness of the MES approach to urban educational problems. [For one of the program reports covered by this document, see ED 014 525, "Expansion of the More Effective Schools Program."] (Author/DM)

ED044471

EVALUATING MES

A survey of research on the More Effective Schools plan.

By Simon Beagle

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

UD011043

The American Federation of Teachers' More Effective Schools program, since its inception in New York City in 1964, has been adopted by a number of other cities as a workable program for educating children in deprived-area schools. In each of the many reports and evaluations of the MES program in New York and elsewhere, it has been pointed out that this plan of lower class size and saturation services has created an atmosphere in which children, teachers, and parents gain increased faith in the schools and enjoy significantly greater rapport and enthusiasm in working together.

But the question has always been, do the children learn more? Because the More Effective Schools program involves increased expenditures on the schools, observers naturally wish to know if these additional funds are buying measurably better results.

Other Publications on More Effective Schools:

152 Design for an Effective Schools Program in Urban Centers, 50 cents
183 Effective Schools for all Children, $2.50 for 100
301 Ghetto Schools—Problems and Panaceas, 40 cents
302 Debunking the Myths About MES, 10 cents
303 Questions and Answers About More Effective Schools, 10 cents
234 A New Look at MES in Light of the Coleman and Racial Isolation Reports, $2.50 for 100
251 The More Effective Schools Program in New York City, 5 cents
236 New Hope for City Schools, 5 cents

Please order by number from the Order Department,

American Federation of Teachers,
1012 14th St. N.W., Washington, D. C. 20005

SIMON BEAGLE

The fact that children will learn more and learn faster when they have the educational advantages offered by the More Effective Schools plan has been demonstrated time and again by scholarly research. Most recently, the bureau of educational research of the New York City board of education found that the mean gain in reading comprehension of MES students over non-MES students ranged from 2.5 to 4.5 school months over the period studied.

"Evaluating MES" summarizes this new longitudinal study from New York City and also reports the results of previous research on MES. These hard, statistically significant facts, coupled with the enthusiasm that one finds among students and teachers enrolled in the program, are the best testimonials to the basic soundness of the MES approach to urban educational problems.

Because of this soundness, as demonstrated in New York City's 21 More Effective Schools, and because of the tenacity of American Federation of Teachers locals in demanding implementation of MES in other big cities, the boards of education in Baltimore, Detroit, Chicago, Cleveland, New Haven, and Washington, D. C., have voted to adopt the MES plan in certain schools. MES is already in operation in Baltimore, Detroit, and New Haven; it will be started in the other cities soon.

This booklet is a guide to research done on MES through April, 1969. As future studies become available, they will be reported in new editions of "Evaluating MES." Meanwhile, you will find reports of new research on MES regularly in the pages of the American Teacher.

—SIMON BEAGLE, Chairman
National Council for
Effective Schools, AFT

Now, after five years experience with the program in New York City, enough evidence is being made available to indicate that the students in MES schools do, indeed, learn more than their counterparts in comparable schools. This booklet presents important findings from these studies, as well as indicating where the full reports may be obtained and listing additional literature on the MES program.

In the latter part of 1965, a year after the MES program was started, I wrote the following:[1]

"It would be folly to believe that the MES program is the ultimate answer to the many problems facing our urban schools. To us, it is but one of the first halting steps which is being taken to come to grips with persistent and prevailing educational ills. Much more must be done in teacher training and retraining, in curriculum development, in educational research, in total community involvement, in ongoing objective evaluation of the total program and its constituent parts, and in the development of new materials and instructional techniques. The MES program makes such changes possible.

"However, considering the recency of the program and the current conditions under which it must operate, we think the following conclusions are valid:

"**1.** More Effective Schools are gaining increasing numbers of experienced, regularly-appointed teachers because of the conditions existing in these schools. Fewer than 20 out of about 800 teachers left the program at the end of the first year, even though all had the privilege of leaving at the end of the year without prejudice. The teachers in ME Schools *want* to remain.

"**2.** More Effective Schools are freed from the class-coverage problem. Most of these schools now have waiting lists of those seeking assignment and similar lists for day-to-day substitute work.

"**3.** More Effective Schools are giving evidence that they are sufficiently attractive to a growing number of middle-class high-aspiration families for them to want to remain in MES areas. These parents are seeking to place their children in ME Schools because they find ME Schools superior to many in all-white, middle-class areas.

"**4.** A new hope and better morale is now evident, even at this early stage of the MES program, among MES staffs, children, and their parents.

"**5.** There is solid evidence that children in ME Schools are achieving at a higher level than are children in comparable schools not in the MES program, and that they are making greater gains than many children in "normal" schools.

"**6.** Teachers, pupils, and parents are not as fearful, tense, and frustrated as they were before the introduction of the ME Schools program, or as many in non-ME Schools located in disadvantaged areas still are. Teachers can give priority to instructional needs over administrative concerns because of the higher staffing ratios and supportive services."

The enthusiasm for MES is founded in the general belief that most teachers desire the job satisfaction that comes with effective teaching, and that most children and their parents want the effective achievement that comes from sound teaching-learning conditions. These developments take place when a school has a total schoolwide program containing all the needed educational components, as suggested in the basic MES guidelines. This belief is really a truism, but evidence is needed to support even well-founded beliefs.

[1] "The More Effective Schools Program in New York City—a Summary Statement," published by American Federation of Teachers.

THE EVIDENCE

Some statements of such evidence follow:

• The MES program in New York City was evaluated in 1964-65 by the city board of education's office of educational research. In releasing this evaluation, Dr. Bernard E. Donovan, superintendent of schools, wrote:

"Studies of previous achievement showed that these children, on the average, had been improving only six months in reading during any previous eight-month period, so that they fell further and further behind national norms during each school year. Under MES during the eight months between October, 1964, and May, 1965, the children, on the average, made far greater gains in reading than they ever had before." (September, 1965)

• The MES program was evaluated again the following school year, 1965-66, by observers from the Center for Urban Education (CUE); by a special committee of principals (not in the MES program) set up by Dr. Donovan; and by a series of achievement tests given by the office of educational research. The findings, released in a Dec. 7, 1966 report titled "Evaluation of the More Effective Schools Program—Summary Report," were:

"The findings of the appraisal of the More Effective Schools are generally favorable. The objectives have been implemented to a reasonable and satisfactory degree, considering all factors. Class size and pupil-teacher ratios have been very favorable. Pupil and teacher mobility presents no major problems. Pupil attendance presents no problems.

"Standardized test results in reading and arithmetic show favorable gains in ability and skills by the MES pupils whether or not they are compared in growth with national norms or with a comparable control group of schools. Speech and oral communication data also revealed growth of pupils.

"The reaction of administrators, teachers, and parents to the MES program was definitely favorable. They favored reduced class size, individual instruction, teacher preparation periods, prekindergarten classes, and personnel for improved services. Analysis of costs has made it clear that the MES program requires considerable funding. On the basis of the evaluation as a whole, it would appear that the program needs to be kept essentially undiluted if it is to remain effective. If such elements as small class size are not retained, it is quite possible that the educational results will not be as favorable as this report has shown them to be."

• The office of educational research released a report of a longitudinal study (same children in all tests) prepared by George Forlano and Jack Abramson. They reported that the More Effective Schools:

". . . As a group were more effective than the control schools in (1) reducing the reading retardation of their pupils and (2) in producing larger percents of pupils who reached and surpassed the norm from initial to final test during the 1.6 school year period." (April, 1968)

• The Forlano-Abramson team continued its longitudinal studies, and in April, 1969, released its latest findings. The findings answer two key questions: "What is the reading progress of children in ME and comparable schools as compared to normal progress shown in national norms?" and "Are the differences in reading progress in ME and comparable pupil groups statistically significant?" The findings, favorable to the MES concept, are fully summarized on page 7 of this booklet.

READING SCORES—MES AND NON-MES PUPILS[2]

For those who may want to see some additional tables of statistics, I include the following:

- Average Reading Scores of Pupils in the City's Special Service and ME Schools

Testing Month and Year		SEPTEMBER, 1966			APRIL, 1967		
Grade	Type of School	Number Tested	Grade Average	National Norm	Number Tested	Grade Average	National Norm
2	Sp. Serv.	36,940	1.7	2.0	38,080	2.4	2.7
2	**MES**	**2,696**	**1.9**	**2.0**	**2.643**	**2.9**	**2.7**
3	Sp. Serv.	37,164	2.5	3.0	37,259	3.3	3.7
3	**MES**	**2,265**	**2.7**	**3.0**	**2,311**	**3.8**	**3.7**
4	Sp. Serv.	36,973	3.2	4.0	37,062	3.9	4.7
4	**MES**	**2,352**	**3.5**	**4.0**	**2,374**	**4.3**	**4.7**
5	Sp. Serv.	34,613	4.0	5.0	34,780	5.0	5.7
5	**MES**	**2,163**	**4.2**	**5.0**	**2,125**	**5.4**	**5.7**
6	Sp. Serv.	30,772	4.9	6.0	30,217	5.6	6.7
6	**MES**	**965**	**5.5**	**6.0**	**948**	**6.6**	**6.7**

- Reading Test Scores in New York City More Effective Schools—tests given in April, 1967, to all elementary schools (Second Grade).

Second-Grade National Norms—2.7

	SCHOOL	LOCATION	TEST SCORE NORMS
(N)	P.S. 146	East Harlem, Manhattan	2.9
(N)	P.S. 168	East Harlem, Manhattan	3.5
(N)	P.S. 11	Chelsea, Manhattan	3.0
(O)	P.S. 83	East Harlem, Manhattan	2.5
(O)	P.S. 154	Central Harlem, Manhattan	2.6
(O)	P.S. 100	Central Harlem, Manhattan	2.9
(O)	P.S. 1	South Bronx	3.1
(N)	P.S. 110	Mid Bronx	2.8
(O)	P.S. 106	North East Bronx	3.8
(O)	P.S. 102	North East Bronx	3.2
(N)	P.S. 307	Navy Yard, Brooklyn	2.7
(O)	P.S. 120	Navy Yard, Brooklyn	2.4
(O)	P.S. 138	Bedford-Stuyvesant, Brooklyn	2.7
(N)	P.S. 41	East New York, Brooklyn	2.4
(N)	P.S. 165	East New York, Brooklyn	2.4
(N)	P.S. 80	Coney Island, Brooklyn	2.5
(N)	P.S. 183	Far Rockaway, Queens	3.1
(O)	P.S. 40	South Jamaica, Queens	3.0
(N)	P.S. 37	South Jamaica, Queens	3.2
(O)	P.S. 18	Staten Island, Richmond	3.0
(N)	P.S. 31	Staten Island, Richmond	2.9

3 schools—5 months above national norm
3 schools—4 months above national norm
3 schools—3 months above national norm
3 schools—2 months above national norm
2 schools—at national norm
1 school—1 month below national norm
2 schools—2 months below national norm
3 schools—3 months below national norm

Note: (N) indicates the 11 ME Schools which started the MES program in September, 1965.
(O) indicates the 10 ME Schools which started the MES program in September, 1964.

- Differences in Grade Equivalents on the Gates Word Recognition Test Given to First-Grade Pupils in Old and New MES Schools in February and June, 1966.

OLD MES SCHOOLS N=1,168

	2-66 Testing	6-66 Testing	Gain	Elapsed School Years
Q3	2.2	2.9	.7	
Median	1.8	2.4	.6	.5
Q1	1.5	2.0	.5	

NEW MES SCHOOLS N=999

	2-66 Testing	6-66 Testing	Gain	Elapsed School Years
Q3	2.0	2.8	.8	
Median	1.7	2.3	.6	.5
Q1	1.5	2.0	.5	

- To note achievement gains in reading in other grades, the following table is provided:

Grade-Score gains for Each Grade Compared with Elapsed Time at Q3, Median, and Q1 on the Metropolitan Reading Comprehension Tests for All Old ME Schools.

		10-64 Testing	5-66 Testing	Gain	Elapsed School Years
	Q3	2.1	4.6	2.5	
Grade 3	Median	1.8	3.7	1.9	1.7
N=784	Q1	1.5	3.1	1.6	
	Q3	3.2	5.4	2.2	
Grade 4	Median	2.7	4.2	1.5	1.7
N=759	Q1	2.1	3.5	1.4	
	Q3	3.9	6.8	2.9	
Grade 5	Median	3.2	5.2	2.0	1.7
N=735	Q1	2.1	4.2	1.5	
	Q3	5.2	8.8	3.6	
Grade 6	Median	4.2	6.1	1.9	1.7
N=567	Q1	3.5	4.9	1.4	

[2] From a study made by Eugene Blum, Statistician, Bronx Municipal Hospital Center.

It is not sound to rely solely on test scores, important as such may be. Such scores, taken alone, do not tell the whole story regarding the educational values of a school program. There are important variables not evaluated by machine-marked tests: school and classroom climate; attitudes of children, teachers, and parents; pupil attendance; teacher mobility; school and classroom vandalism; intra-school and intraclassroom relations; school-community relations; and progress in curriculum areas other than reading and arithmetic.

SELECTED SUMMARY STATEMENTS FROM REPORTS IDENTIFIED BELOW

Below, I list some statements made by knowledgeable and sophisticated educators and others after "seeing for themselves" by visiting one or more schools in the MES program. Some also visited control schools.

• "In the areas of over-all school climate and staff attitude as sensed by observers, and as reported by administrative staff and teaching faculty, it is clear that in most of the schools in which the MES program has been established, there was an atmosphere and climate characterized by enthusiasm, interest, and hope, and a belief among all levels of staff that they were in a setting in which they could function. Moreover, parents and community, too, have responded with interest and enthusiasm to the MES program in their neighborhood schools. The creation of such positive feelings and climates in a school system which in recent years has evidenced considerable internal stress and school-community conflict is an important accomplishment. It makes clear that school climate can be improved and that relationships can be developed within a brief period of time." ***("Expansion of the More Effective School Program," Center for Urban Education (CUE), August, 1967.)***

• "Forlano and his associates (Forlano and McClelland, 1966: Forlano and Abramson, 1968) evaluated the program, too, and reached the conclusion that reading achievement in MES was indeed superior if MES were compared longitudinally with control schools matched on ethnic background." ***(Final Report, Part II "A Study of Exemplary Programs for the Education of Disadvantaged Children"—USOE, September, 1968, p. 193.)***

BRIEF STATEMENTS FROM WELL-KNOWN EDUCATORS

• "This is the kind of program which should be funded under the Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. It is the kind of program which can provide successful experiences for children." ***(Francis Keppel, former assistant secretary of the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.)***

• "Piecemeal, part-time efforts by school districts to improve the lot of educationally disadvantaged children are wasteful and virtually valueless . . . the More Effective Schools program in New York City has demonstrated that real improvement can be achieved." ***(Prof. Alan Campbell, in a report to the California School Boards Association (July, 1966), describing the results of the Carnegie Foundation National Research Study of federally funded programs for disadvantaged youth.)***

• "By the criteria we used, the observers saw above-average school functioning in the ME Schools and consistent qualitative differences in favor of the ME Schools. Consequently, they felt that the school day was worth more and that they would be satisfied, and even enthusiastic, about sending their child to these schools. . . . The data on class size and grouping indicate that the teachers in ME Schools were taking advantage of the small class size and using ability grouping more consistently than they had in 1967." ***("Evaluation of MES, 1967-68," an interim report by the Center for Urban Education (CUE), released in February, 1969.)***

• "More Effective Schools is the most meaningful program presently operating for disadvantaged youths in urban centers." ***Kenneth Martyn, author of the McCone Commission's report on education in the Watts area of Los Angeles, following the disorders there.)***

• "The Model Schools represent a giant step forward. The Baltimore Teachers Union is to be congratulated on its role in bringing it to our attention.

"On my visit to the MES in New York City, I found a free spirit and high morale on the part of the teachers. Parents were pleased with the program.

"I have visited every classroom in Baltimore's three Model Schools. The classrooms are a joy to visit. It is difficult to describe adequately the spirit of the schools.

"We have the beginnings of the development of an educational program that has promise for Baltimore. The problem must be solved within the ghetto schools.

"I shall recommend the expansion of the Model School program at the elementary level and a follow-on program in junior and senior high schools. We must expand the program. We cannot afford to do otherwise." ***(Dr. Vernon S. Vavrina, associate superintendent for curriculum and instruction, Baltimore, at the BTU conference on Oct. 20, 1967.)***

• "The More Effective Schools program is probably the most comprehensive and well-conceived program of educational compensation launched to date in slum elementary schools." ***Prof. David K. Cohen, The Joint Center for Urban Studies of M.I.T. and Harvard University.)***

• The AFT is pushing this program (MES) very hard. . . . It costs double what we are spending on these children now, but it's the only thing for us to do." ***(Dr. Rufus Browning, assistant superintendent-personnel for the Washington, D. C. schools, at a panel discussion at the American Association of School Administrators convention, February, 1968.)***

• "I think the More Effective Schools Program is a new approach and shows imagination and initiative." ***(The late Senator Robert F. Kennedy.)***

• "The commission feels that through the implementation of a program such as this, quality education for all the city's children can be made possible. I hope that the board of education will listen to the interested parents, teachers, and community people—and will, in addition to continuing the MES program, expand and strengthen it to include other areas in the city. We can see no reason why a good program which is benefiting so many children should not be expanded to help more schools become centers of quality education." ***(Judge William Booth, when he was chairman of the New York City Commission on Human Rights.)***

• "I found excellent relationships between teacher and children, teacher and supervisor, and teacher and teacher. There were small groups at work in every room throughout the school. No matter where I went, I found teachers working diligently with children. There were many indications of a more one-to-one relationship due to the increased

personnel which is so integrally a part of the More Effective Schools guidelines.

"The children appeared relaxed and happy! The general atmosphere throughout the school was one of stimulated activity! Of course, the additional personnel and services undoubtedly help to create this fine educational environment." ***(Nathan Brown, executive deputy superintendent, New York City, in a letter to Mrs. Joan Agin, P.S. 40-Q, March 4, 1969.)***

• "I have been studying the various methods by which we can fund them [the More Effective Schools] because we do not intend to let them disintegrate. . . . Please be assured of our continued interest in supporting this program." ***(Dr. Bernard E. Donovan, superintendent of schools, New York City, in a letter to Mrs. Frances D. Turner of the Citywide More Effective Schools Parents Association, March 3, 1969.)***

• "Where the schools do their job, there is no anger. This had been abundantly proven here in New York, by the strong parent support for the More Effective Schools program in ghetto neighborhoods having successful ME Schools. Dr. Bernard Donovan, the able city school superintendent, who has now been driven to chuck in his hand at the end of this year, has also been driven to admit privately that his greatest mistake was not giving more active support to MES." ***(Columnist Joseph Alsop, writing in the Long Island Press, Feb. 7, 1969.)***

1969 FINDINGS, NEW YORK CITY BOARD OF EDUCATION BUREAU OF EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH FORLANO-ABRAMSON REPORT

In April, 1969, the New York City board of education released an interim report, "Longitudinal Study of Reading Growth in Selected More Effective and Comparable Schools," prepared by George Forlano and Jack Abramson for the Office of Educational Research.[3] The following excerpts from this report add to the weight of the statistical evidence proving that the MES program is indeed effective in raising the achievement levels of the pupils by reducing the retardation gap and moving the students toward the national norms. *Following are major excerpts from the report:*

[3] Only the Forlano-Abramson reports are based on strict longitudinal studies, that is, the same children are in both the initial and final tests.

This interim report presents evidence on the extent of pupil growth in reading in More Effective and comparable schools in terms of standardized test results. The full study will report also the results in arithmetic achievement.

The specific questions to be answered are as follows:

1. What is the reading progress of the children in the More Effective and comparable schools as compared to normal progress indicated in national norms?
2. Are the differences in mean reading achievements of ME and comparable pupil groups statistically significant?

Initial test for the third-grade groups was October, 1966, when they were in the second grade. Initial test for fourth- and fifth-grade groups was October, 1965, when they were in the second and third grades, respectively.

As indicated in the table above, the initial mean grade scores of the third-grade MES and non-MES pupil groups were identical, 1.7. Since the norm at initial test time in October, 1966, for the two groups was 2.1, both groups were performing at .4 of a school year (four school months) below the norm. This result is indicated in the column headed Mean-Norm Diff. at initial test time.

At final test time, the MES third-grade group achieved a mean grade score of 3.8 while the non-MES group obtained a grade score of 3.1. When the latter-obtained mean scores were compared with the norm of 3.7 at final test time, it was found that the MES group scored .1 of a school year (one school month) above the norm while the non-MES group registered .6 of a school year (six school months) below the norm. In terms of over-all net change, the MES gained .5 of a school year while its control counterpart dropped .2 of a school year in relation to the norms over the period studied.

Similarly, at the fourth grade, the MES group gained .4 of a school year while the non-MES gained .1 of a school year in relation to the norms over the period studied. At the fifth grade, the MES group was .6 of a school year below the norm at both initial and final test time, and showed no gain or loss in relation to the norms. On the other hand, the non-MES group was .7 of a school year below the norm at initial test time and one school year below the norm at final test time, indicating additional retardation of .3 of a school year in relation to the norms.

Over-all, these MES groups revealed superior performance in word knowledge and reading comprehension when compared with the performance of non-MES counterparts.

Based on the longitudinal comparisons of these participating pupils in the third, fourth, and fifth grades in four

Comparisons of Grade Norms and Mean Grade Scores on the Metropolitan Word Knowledge Initial and Final Test for Pupils in Four Special-Service "Old" ME Schools with Pupils in Four Special-Service Comparable Schools

		(Oct., 1966) *Initial*			(April, 1968) *Final*			
		N	Mean	Norm	Mean-Norm Diff.	Mean	Norm	Mean-Norm Diff.	Net Change
				Third Grade					
Third	MES	395	1.7	2.1	—.4	3.8	3.7	+ .1	+.5
	Non-MES	491	1.7	2.1	—.4	3.1	3.7	— .6	—.2
				Fourth Grade					
Fourth	MES	282	1.8	2.1	—.3	4.8	4.7	+ .1	+.4
	Non-MES	292	1.8	2.1	—.3	4.5	4.7	— .2	+.1
				Fifth Grade					
Fifth	MES	263	2.5	3.1	—.6	5.1	5.7	— .6	.0
	Non-MES	314	2.4	3.1	—.7	4.7	5.7	—1.0	—.3

matched ME and control non-ME schools, the following conclusions may be drawn:

1. There is a consistent pattern of more growth in reading on the part of the various MES grade groups when compared to the growth shown by comparable non-MES groups.

2. The pattern of greater growth on the part of the MES groups appeared when the results were analyzed by the use of grade norms and when the gains were analyzed for statistical significance.

3. The reduction in reading retardation was, in general, greater for the MES groups as compared to that for the comparable groups.

CONCLUSION

There is enough statistical and other evidence to assure all that the MES program offers sound educational guidelines and makes pupil achievement possible. The identification of the MES program in a report issued in September, 1968, by the United States Office of Education as an "exemplary program for the education of children in disadvantaged areas," should add to this assurance. The yearly evaluation reports all stress the growing enthusiasm for the MES program by school staffs, children, and their parents, as well as community leaders. Teacher morale is high and teacher mobility low.

Parent participation has increased in number and in quality. Pupil attendance has risen sharply and school and classroom discipline has been reduced to a minimum, and so has school and classroom vandalism. All observers have noted the positive school climate, one of the more visible features in all ME Schools.

The MES program is being adopted and adapted by a growing number of school systems throughout the nation. National and state legislative bodies are considering passage of "More Effective Schools Acts." The State of California has already passed such legislation.

Many experimental programs have been advanced and implemented by the New York City school system, but none is total and schoolwide, as is the MES program, and none contains the necessary guidelines and educational ingredients (as a totality) to assure the possibility of long-range success.

No one has challenged the essential soundness and integrity of the MES program. Whatever criticisms have been made have dealt with aspects of implementation. Such criticism is necessary and legitimate, for no matter how inherently sound an educational program may be, it is doomed to failure if those responsible for implementation are incompetent, indifferent, or antagonistic.

The American Federation of Teachers and its affiliated state and local bodies will continue to campaign for the expansion of the MES program until all of our nation's youth are taught in effective schools.

APPENDIX

For the complete evaluation reports, write to the following:

1. Hortense Jones, Acting Director
   MES Program
   Board of Education
   131 Livingston St.
   Brooklyn, New York 11201
2. Dr. George Forlano, Assistant Administrative Director
   Office of Educational Research
   Board of Education
   110 Livingston St.
   Brooklyn, New York 11201
3. The Center for Urban Education—The 1967 and 1968 Reports on MES. The CUE also put out a special supplement on MES (May, 1968) containing evaluation of CUE 1967 report by Sidney Schwager and Prof. Harry Gottesfeld. The Center for Urban Education is located at 105 Madison Ave., New York, N.Y. 10016.
4. The USOE Office of Programs and Evaluation, Washington, D. C., has had a study prepared by a research team from Palo Alto. This team studied over 1,000 compensatory programs. They recommend 21. MES is one. The title is, "A Study of Selected Exemplary Programs for the Education of Disadvantaged Children," Part II, September, 1968.
5. The Psychological Corporation (304 E. 45th St., New York, N.Y.) is preparing an evaluation report on MES for 1968-1969. It will be out in the fall of 1969.

AFT

Published by American Federation of Teachers, 1012 14th St. N.W., Washington, D.C. 20005

Please order number 319; 10 cents per copy.